

24. A system according to claim 1, wherein the selection means selects under control of call data signals indicative of dialed number identification signals (DNIS) automatically provided by the communication facility.

B²
25. A system according to claim 1, wherein the selection means selects under control of call data signals indicative of calling number identification signals automatically provided by the communication facility.

26. A system according to claim 1, further comprising:
memory for storing data relating to calls.

27. A system according to claim 26, wherein the data relating to calls includes billing data.--

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the office action dated October 27, 1999. At the outset, Applicant notes that the official filing receipt sent by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office inaccurately indicates the chain of applications from which the present application claims priority. A copy of the official filing receipt indicating the errors is attached with this response. It is respectfully requested that the record in the file be updated to reflect the corrections.

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1, for two reasons. First, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting based on claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,351,285. The Examiner indicates that present claim 1 is broader in scope and not patentably distinct from claim 1 of Applicant's prior patent no. 5,351,285. Second, the Examiner rejected claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) based on Masson and also under 35 U.S.C Section 102(b) based on Hester.

Claim 1 requires "*selecting one of the formats under control of the call data means to thereby specify any defined conditions for a connection of a call either to said multiple port, multiple format processor or one of said live operator stations*" (emphasis by underlining added, see Applicant's Figure 1). It is respectfully submitted that Masson does not disclose this aspect. At best, Masson teaches redirecting a call to a live operator (see Abstract in Masson and

Figures). In column 5, lns. 36-49, Masson describes how operators can assist with data entry when the computer and the callers do not seem to be communicating. Applicant submits that Hester likewise does not disclose this feature whereby a call is directly connected to a live operator under control of the call data signals. At page 4, third paragraph, Hester describes that the "*peripherals currently available for the AT&T voice system include line transfer capability to connect callers to operators, ...*" (emphasis by underlining added). Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw her 35 U.S.C. Section 102 rejections of claim 1 based on the arguments urged above. It should be noted that claim 1 is amended for further clarification.

Applicant is submitting a terminal disclaimer with respect to his prior patent no. 5,351,285 to obviate the double patenting rejection.

Finally, Applicant is submitting new claims 18-27 that directly or ultimately depend on claim for the Examiner's consideration. Favorable consideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LYON & LYON LLP

By: 

Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830

Dated: April 27, 2000

633 West Fifth Street, Suite 4700
Los Angeles, California 90071-2066
(213) 489-1600